United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/689,474	10/20/2003	Bruce P. Konen	1110-0462	7873	
Joel H. Bock	7590 05/04/2007		EXAMINER		
COOK, ALEX, McFARRON,			FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR		
	MMINGS & MEHLER, 1 ns Street - Suite 2850	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Chicago, IL 60	0606		3724		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/689,474	KONEN, BRUCE P.	
Office Action Summ	nary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Omar Flores-Sánchez	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this of Period for Reply	communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	;s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM - Extensions of time may be available under the after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of - If NO period for reply is specified above, the miliar to reply within the set or extended perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended perion - Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	THE MAILING D provisions of 37 CFR 1. If this communication. Inaximum statutory period and for reply will, by statut the months after the mailir	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commun BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			,	·
 Responsive to communication This action is FINAL. Since this application is in concluded in accordance with the 	2b)∏ This ondition for allowa	s action is non-final. ance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the me D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	rits is
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-8 and 13</u> is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>13</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-7</u> is/are rejected to 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>8</u> is/are objected to 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to	is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers		,		
9) The specification is objected 10) The drawing(s) filed on Applicant may not request that	_ is/are: a)☐ acc any objection to the including the correc	cepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a a) All b) Some * c) No 1. Certified copies of the 2. Certified copies of the	ne of: priority document priority document copies of the prio ternational Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in A rity documents have beer u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stag	je
Attachment(s)				. 1
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing F Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/689,474

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 02/15/07.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saltus-Werk (DE 3939816 A1) in view of Dickey et al. (5,371,947).

Saltus-Werk discloses the invention substantially as claimed including:

• Claim 1; a housing 4, first and second cutting blades (2 and 24) and a drive assembly including a drive shaft 11, a first gear 13, a second gear 15, a drive gear 18 and a main shaft 16.

Regarding claim 1, 3 and 5, Saltus-Werk does not show a torque arm with first, second and third portions adjacent to the handle; a torque arm clamp and an attachment element with a hook. However, Dickey et al. teaches the use of a torque arm 11 with first (left side of the support yoke 14), second (right side of the support yoke 14) and third portions (center portion of the support yoke 14) adjacent to the handle (see Fig. 1), a torque arm clamp 13 and an attachment element with hook 14 for the purpose of providing secure of the drill. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

Application/Control Number: 10/689,474

Art Unit: 3724

modified Saltus-Werk's cutter by providing the torque arm, the torque arm clamp and the

attachment element with the hook as taught by Dickey et al. in order to obtain a better secure of

the drill. Regarding claim 1; Dickey et al. shows the torque arm is adjacent to the lateral sides of

the grip portion (see Fig. 1). Regarding claim 5, Dickey et al. shows the torque arm slidably

connected to the torque arm (see Fig. 4, where the flanges 11 slide relative to the axle 13).

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saltus-

Werk (DE 3939816 A1) in view of Dickey et al. (5,371,947) as applied to claim 1 above, and

further in view of Rudolf et al. (6,155,916).

The modified device of Saltus-Werk discloses the invention substantially as claimed

except for a stabilizing handle that can be attached to left and right sides of the housing.

However, Rudolf et al. teach the use of a stabilizing handle 30 that can be attached to left and

right sides (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 64-67; and col. 6, lines 1-3) of the housing for the purpose of

allowing right and left hand operators to use the device. It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified

Saltus-Werk's device by providing the stabilizing handle as taught by Rudolf et al. in order to

obtain a device that can be used by right and left hand operators.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 13 is allowed.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/689,474

Art Unit: 3724

6. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues that neither Saltus-Werk and Frod et al teaches a drive gear that is mounted on the main shaft and engageable with one of the cutting blades. However, there is no language in the claims that the drive gear is directly engageable with one of the cutting blades, for that reason, Saltus-Werk teaches the drive gear 18 engageable (by gears 20 and 22) with one of the cutting blades.

Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Trumbull et al. is cited to show a related device.
- 9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 3724

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ofs 4/24/07

BOYER D. ASHLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER